Subject! ZELENSKY, Pimen Gordeyevich, and ZHLUKTENKO, Yuriy Alekseyevich

Source: 0 and Y

Date: 12 August 1965

DÆCLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3 B 2 B NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT DATE 2007

- 1. After much difficulty ZELENSKY was contacted by 0, in the following manner: 0. had been trying to reach him in his room for some time and had been unsuccessful due to the fact that the group was always busy with other engagments. Finally ZELENSKY replied to 0.'s telephone call from two days previously and a meeting was arranged. ZELENSKY informe 0. that he would come with another friend, ZHLUKTENKO, to the meeting. 0. decided also to bring a friend, E.The meeting took place in a German restaurant and lasted app. 4 hours.
- 2. ZELENSKY, Pimen Gordeyevich: Ukrainian, born in DONBAS, Eastern Ukraine. Lives and works in Lviv from 1945. Presently is the head of the department of Foriegn Languages of Lviv University, and is very proud of this positition. Is one of the most influential persons on the committee which reviews applications for entrance to the University. Z. contends that he tries to accept as many Ukrainian students from Western Ukraine as possib and often travels to outlaying regions (Hutsulchyna and Sambirchyna) to recruit new studer Politically

Politically subject is a typical cultural commisar, a "Soviet man" through and through. Acts like a prophet of the Soviet system, and its defender in all aspects. Refuses to listen to any mention of Ukrainian independance, saying that Ukraine is united with Russia in all aspects of national life. Basically is not a very deep person, who falls into pathos and behaves very emotionally when engaged in longer conversation. Is very strong in his anti-American, anti-Nationalist, anti-War feelings. Operates with phrases like a profession agitator, always has an answer to all questions, and these are along the party line.

Subject is married and has a son and daughter. The son attends a Russian school in Lviv, while the daughter goes to a Ukrainian one. Subject is tall, handsome. Pleasant manners, and quite easygoing. Has acquired Western Ukrainian mannerisms, dresses elegently. During his long stay in Western Ukraine has come to like it, and is proud of its achievments. Has many Western Ukrainian friends and vacations with them at DORA.

3. ZHLUKTENKO, Yuriy Alekseyevich: Born in Eastern Ukraine. Ukrainian. Is a friendly person, willing to listen to other then the official party line on a variety of problems such as publishing (he is well acquainted in this field) Subject sees shortcomings in the regime and is troubled by them, also is willing to discuss them. Has a knowledge of Young Ukrainian poets, and literature in general. In discussion likes to stay in the background, and give his collegue the first say. Discusses matters calmly and does not shoot the breeze. Subject is of average height. Presently resides in Kiev.

4. RUSSIFICATION IN UKRAINE:

ZHLUKTENKO stated that there is no planned Russification in Ukraine at the present. Instead, what is going on now is the natural course of events and only they alone are responsible for it. The program of the CPSU, in particular the chapter about "drawing together of nations" is not an official political line, instead it is tailored for a longe period of time. At present there are many Russians living in Ukraine, and many of them are still chauvanists. In addition there are also many Ukrainians who help them. (Malorosy) as 0. called them, and ZHLUKTENKO repeated this term. These people are ppportunists who care only for themselves, and their career, while negating their national pride. Such people are found in every nation, and very frequently among Ukrainians. At present there is much being done in Ukraine to improve the situation, more then is evident at first. the emmigration only reads the newspapers, and this media does not mention such matte Actually a battle is being waged against the neglect of the national language, against discrimination of Ukrainian culture. These problems are not new to them, and the emmigration is not opening anyones eyes by stating same. The problem of small editions of books, went on ZHLUKTENKO, was the responsibility of UKRKNYHOTORHY, which pe operated only on bushess principles, print only enough to sell. Presently the Association of Writers of Ukraine is waging a fisce battle with this firm on the problem of increasing the number of Ukrainian books printed. Another reason given was the lack of paper in the USSR.

In Ukrainian Universities, the language of instruction is steadily becoming Ukrainian more and more. This causes a certain problem, since there are many exchange students in Ukraine at the present and they are not familiar with Ukrainian. If there is a small number of say negro students in a certain class the lecturer speaks Ukrainian, but some lecturers



will change to Russian if there is a large number of negroes in the class. But there are also professors who demand that all students speak Ukrainian in class. Even Russian who teach in Ukrainian Universities learn Ukrainian after a while and teach in it. ZELENSKY gave a few examples from Lviv of this nature, but later it came out that his son went to a Russian school in Lviv while his daughter attended a Ukrainian one. The reason he gave was that more practical for his son to learn Russian, since he learned Ukrainian at home. Later ZHLUTENKO explained to 0. that ZELENSKY tried to simplify matters too much, because in reality there are problems with Russification, adding that they are trying to improve the situation, in any way they can.

5. SCHOOLS FOR UKRAINIANS IN THE RSFSR:

Both subjects stated that there are no Ukrainian schools in RSFSR because no one demand them. When asked by 0. if it is possible that out of 3½ million Ukrainians in the RSFSR not even one demands to have Ukrainian schools, or at least leasons in Ukrainian in Russian schools for children. Both subjects remained silent on this question. 0. asked sarcasticly if this question went out with the death of SKRYPNYK, and there is not one Ukrainian who will raise this question. Both subjects replied with partylk line phrases that Ukrainians outside the Ukraine can be subscribe to Ukrainian newspapers, books, and so forth. Source pointed out that this is true, but Russians in Ukraine have their own schools, papers, books etc. and asked if this is not a form of discrimination, against Ukrainians. ZHLUKTENKO tried to defend himself by saying that he is not too well informed in these matters, and such matters are for the Ministry of Culture. 0. proposed that when he returns to Kiev he should speak to BODNAR the Minister of Culture of the Ukraine and ask him how matters really stand, explain to him why the emmigration complains the way it does, and he might get an answer. ZHIUKTENKO commented that this was good advice.

6. UKRAINE AND THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION:

After a few drinks 0. Leads told subjects that he wanted to put his cards on the table saying that he and Y. both belonged to the catagory of Ukrainians which the Soviet regime calls berg bourgeois nationalists, except that they were not bourgeois, neith er were they the sort of nationalists that subscribed to an nationalism as being a fundamental

SEC IT

ideology. Instead they stood on the posititions of Ukrainian independence, without any brother nations. And that Ukraine as an independent nation can grow economicly as any other nation. Both subjects argued against this theory, with ZELENSKY taking a more active role. Ukraine they said cannot exist as an independent nation because other nations always try to enslave it, and that it has been tied together very closely with the Russian nation for ages. Presently a new society is being built in the USSR and Ukraine is a full partner in this process. O and Y replied that Ukraine suffered very much from its partnership with Russia, in the days of the Russian empire, and presently, during the Soviet regime. ZELENSKY started naming the achievments of Ukraine during the Soviet regime. O. asked if Ukraine could not have achieved these accomplishments as an independent nation without the loss of thousands of its intelligencia and millions of ordinary people. Subjects did not answer. O. went on by stating that Soviet propaganda presents Ukrainian independence only in two aspects, either Ukraine is united with Russia. or under western imperialism, either there is a Soviet form of government or a return to the pre-revolutionary form. Never is the third alternative, Ukrainian independence, put forth. ZHLUKTENKO argued that Ukraine suffered very much during Nazi Germany, and only the USSR saved it from complete liquidation. O. replied that Ukraine was only a territorial factor in the war, at the same time agreeing that Ukraine suffered great losses. Countries like Rumania and Bulgaria and Hungary which colloborated with Germany and fought nazism at the same time managed to come out of the war in better condition. Thi: was the result of their being free nations, with their own armies and governments, and other nations necessary with them . If Ukraine had had an army and government, she would have been an international factor to be reckend with. Subjects continued to argue that Ukraine must go with Mussia together. O. brought out the fact that even after the war, Ukraine suffered from Stalinist terror, and SOSURA had to repent publicly in PRAVDA for his poem "Lubit Ukraing" (Love Ukraine). ZHLUKTENKO replied that presently this poem is being published and read. ZELENSKY asked for the third time, "What are yo u doing concretely to prevent a third world war" The first two times 0. did not reply to this question, considering it a common provocation, the third time he stated that as emmigrants

they had very little say in Washington, or other major capitals of the world. If Moscow or Washington decided to start a war the emmigration was helpless to stop them. But, went on 0. the emmigration is trying to save Ukraine from the dangers of destruction in the event of a war. The Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council presented a memorandum to the members of NATO and all the major powers, about making Ukraine a demiliterized zone. Ther asking subjects what they, in Kiev, did to help Ukraine in case of war. Subjects commented that this memorandum about the demilitarization of a part of the USSR will never be accepted by the USSR because it hopes to divide separate Ukraine from the rest of the USSR. The Soviet Union will never remove its rocket bases and armies from Ukraine.

ZHLUKTENKO explained that at the present, due to the internation situation, it is impossible for Ukraine to have diplomatic relations with the US. There are prelimanary talks going on now about the exchange of counsulets with Kiev, and these might lead to embass@s eventually.

On the question of "the Ukrainian road to Social ism" and Mae Tse Tung's conception of "blooming of hundreds of flowers", ZELENSKY rejected both, saying that Ukraine has united itself with Russia and other nations in the Soviet Union. ZHLUKTENKO remained silent.

7. FIRE IN KIEV LIBRARY:

(Conversation between 0. and ZHLUKTENKO) According to ZHLUKTENKO, the arsonist

POHRMZALSKY was insane. After setting fire to the library he tried to escape through

a the window which he broke and in this attempt was injured, and caught by soldiers. The

fire was put out by water, since the soldiers did not know that phosporous was burning

they rushed into the building and many were overcome by smoke. Also the water helped the

said that Pohryzalsky

fire to spread. In reply to 0.'s question, ZHLUKTENKOV procured the phosporous in a laborat
ory where he had good friends. ZHLUKTENKO went on that if the government wanted to destroy

Ukrainian archievs there are better ways of doing it, a public burning for example, or

secret transport and burning. O.gave subject a copy of document from SUCHASNIST.

8. STAINED GLASS WINDOW IN KIEV UNIVERSITY:

ZHLUKTENKO confirmed that there was an incident with the window in the university.

The reason being that the window was to modernistic and the rector wanted it taken down.

the artists did not agree and the matter went to the CL JPU and other official organs. Finally the window was removed. O. gave subject the other version of the matter, asking why the rector decided that the window should be removed even before it was completed, and why it had to be broken by a hammer, and boarded up. Subject did not answer, saying that he was not too well informed about this matter. O. gave subject SUCHASNIST with story of destruction of window and photograph.

9. MUSCELLANY:

Was familiar with DZ/BA, calling him conceited and arrogant. Added that he fell out of favor for his umproper lecture, not too long ago at a meeting where he praised SEMONENKO and called him "our flag", "our example to follow". Subjects were informed of the trip of KOLLOSOVA to the USA and were familiar with the makeup of the delegation. They said that nationalists protested against this group very strongly. ZHLUKTENKO said that he was very familiar with KOLLOSOVA. ZHLUKTENKO said that there were many Ukrainians in the government at present and the situation is improving, but was not sure about the future. Subject did not know about PIDHORNIY., and could not say why there was no mention of him in press for long time, explaining that in the USSR there were little mentions of the leaders, this was a leftover from "revolutionary secrecy" and often there is no mention of the leaders. ZELENSKY mentioned that he lives in Lviv from 1945 and in the vicinity where KOSTELNYK was killed. ZHLUKTENKO complained that America did not give them a visa for a long time.

Also complained that they cannot visit Canada after USA.

O. gave both subjects KOZHELIVET'S books SUCHASNA LITERATYRA V URSR, and PANORAMA SUCASNOI LITERATYRY URSR, and LEHKOSYNIA DAHL. Also SUCHASNIST # 1-6/65 for ZHLUKTENKO, who handed the journals to ZELENSKY saying that he has more room for them in his room.

